



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/489,759	01/21/2000	Brian Styles	570-A00-001	6224

23334 7590 05/16/2003

FLEIT, KAIN, GIBBONS,
GUTMAN & BONGINI, P.L.
ONE BOCA COMMERCE CENTER
551 NORTHWEST 77TH STREET, SUITE 111
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER

NAJJAR, SALEH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 05/16/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/489,759

Applicant(s)

STYLES, BRIAN

Examiner

Saleh Najjar

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2154

1. This action is responsive to the application filed on January 21, 2000. Claims 1-29 are pending. Claims 1-29 represent a method, system and program for managing network client logon scripts using a graphical management and administration tool.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1, 4, 6-8, 11-13, 15, 18, 20, 21-24, 26-27, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by O'Neil et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,330,710.

O'NEILL teaches the invention as claimed including a servlet based architecture for dynamic service composition (see abstract).

As to claim 1, O'Neil teaches a method in a client-server environment, to manage the configuration of resources on at least one client, the method on a client system comprising the steps of:

receiving a configuration template on a computer readable medium containing one or more defined configuration settings (see figs. 1-3; col. 5, lines 35-45; col. 7, lines 28-34 (O'Neil discloses a template that is filled defining one or more configuration settings); and

executing an application program that takes the template and applies at least one of the defined configuration settings to the client system so as to automatically configure for at least one user on the client system, at least one

Art Unit: 2154

configuration setting (see col. 5-6, O'Neil discloses that agent servlet 330 executes the template to generate a script for execution on the client to change configuration settings.

As to claim 4, O'Neil teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the step of receiving a configuration template includes receiving a configuration template containing one or more defined configuration settings for an application running on the client system (see col. 5-6).

As to claim 6, O'Neil teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the step of receiving a configuration template includes receiving a configuration template from a server system (see figs. 1-3; col. 3-4).

As to claim 7, O'Neil teaches the method according to claim 1, further comprising the step of:

executing a interpretative engine that interprets the application program as source programming language; and wherein the step of executing an application program includes executing an application program on the interpretative engine (see col. 3-6).

As to claim 8, O'Neil teaches the method according to claim 7, further comprising the step of:

receiving a custom application script on a computer readable medium, the custom application script in a source programming that is interpreted by the interpretative engine; and wherein the step executing an application program includes executing an application program along with the custom application script so as to automatically configure for at least one user, at least one configuration setting (see col. 1-3, O'Neil discloses that services requiring dynamically changing data is configurable by the application).

As to claims 11-12, O'Neil teaches method according to claim 1, wherein the step of executing an application program includes executing an application program that takes the template and applies at least one of the defined configuration settings to the client system so as to automatically configure for at least one user on the client system, at least one configuration setting if the combination of one or more predefined

conditions for selected group, MAC address, user name, workstation name, TCP/IP address, host address, site, domain, operating system and connection method are met (see col. 3-6).

As to claim 13, O'Neil teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the step of executing an application program includes executing an application program that takes the template and applies at least one of the defined configuration settings to an application running on the client system so as to automatically configure for at least one user on the client system, at least one configuration setting if the combination of one or more predefined conditions for a selected group, MAC address, user name, workstation name, TCP/IP address, host address, site, domain, operating system and connection method are met (see col. 3-6, O'Neil discloses that the script is used to alter the configuration of an application program running on a client machine).

Claims 15, 18, 20, 21-24, 26-27, and 29 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 1, 4, 6-8, 11-13 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 5, 9-10, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neil.

O'Neil teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a servlet based architecture for dynamic service composition (see abstract).

As to claim 5, O'Neil teaches the method according to claim 1.

O'Neil does not explicitly teach the step of receiving a configuration template includes receiving a configuration template containing one or more defined configuration settings for redirecting a resource on the client to a resource on a network.

However, "Official Notice" is taken that the concept and advantages of using a script to redirect client requests is old and well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify O'Neil by redirecting the client to other servers for service. One would be motivated to do so to provide controlled access to resources.

As to claims 9-10, O'NEILL teaches the method according to claim 8 above.

O'Neil does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation, wherein the step of executing an application program includes executing the custom application script prior to the execution of the application program and wherein the step of executing an application program includes executing the custom application script after the execution of the application program.

However, "Official Notice" is taken that the concept and advantages of executing configuration script prior to or after the execution of an application program is old and well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify O'Neil by specifying execution of the configuration script prior or after execution of the program.

Claims 19 does not teach or define any new limitation above claims 5, 9-10 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

6. Claims 2-3, 14, 16-17, 25, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neil further in view of Paul et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,466,972.

O'Neil teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a servlet based architecture for dynamic service composition (see abstract).

As to claims 2-3, 12, and 14, O'Neil teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the step of receiving a configuration template includes receiving a configuration template containing one or more defined configurations.

O'Neil fails to teach the limitation wherein the configuration consist from the group of drive mappings, shell folders, printer deployment, proxy server access, application paths, service packs, anti-virus updates, policies, automatic mail profile

Art Unit: 2154

creation, and operating system. O'Neil does teach that the configuration settings deal with dynamic and static software functionality (see col. 1-3).

However, Paul teaches a server based configuration of network computers via templates (see abstract). Paul teaches that configurations to client computers consist of configuration parameters for operating system, hardware, peripherals, video and printers (see col. 16, lines 15-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify O'Neil in view of Paul so that operating system, hardware, peripherals, video and printers configuration are performed. One would be motivated to do so to affect a remote boot or to install an operating system of the client machine.

Claims 16-17, 25, and 28 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 2-3, 14 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Lewis et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,243,747.
- Arrouye et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,256,635.
- Prager et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,838,918.
- Kenner et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,314,565.
- Inoue et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,252,858.
- Hansen, U.S. Patent No. 5,838,907.
- Malik et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,349,306.
- Malik et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,832,503.
- Lenz, U.S. Patent No. 6,029,196.
- Arrow et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,226,751.
- Casey et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,209,031.
- Ahearn et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,926,463.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saleh Najjar whose telephone number is (703) 308-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30 to 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Ario Etienne*, can be reached on (703) 308-7562. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-9052.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600. The fax number for the After-Final correspondence/amendment is (703) 746-7238. The fax number for official correspondence/amendment is (703) 746-7239. The fax number for Non-official draft correspondence/amendment is (703) 746-7240.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Saleh Najjar', with a stylized, cursive script.

Saleh Najjar
Primary Examiner / Art Unit 2157